

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

Specification

The objection to paragraph 0093 of the disclosure is corrected as suggested. In line 3, "6" is changed to -106--.

The Action further objects to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP 608.01(o) and asserts that proper antecedent basis is not provided for "movable body" in claim 9, the subject matter of claim 14 and "means for moving" set forth in claim 18.

With respect to the subject matter of claim 9, applicant respectfully traverses the objection and submits that clear antecedent basis is provided in the specification for "movable body". Line 1 of paragraph 0054, for example, in discussing valve element drive mechanism 4, states "the ring-shaped sprocket 8 (movable body) shown in Figs. 8(A) and 8(B)...". Thus, applicant cannot understand the reason for the objection and believes that it should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests clarification if the objection is maintained.

With respect to the subject matter of claim 14, "0.2mm" has been amended to "2mm" to correspond with the description in paragraph 0105 of the specification. This was an inadvertent clerical error, and claim 14 now finds proper antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim 18 is canceled, without prejudice, rendering the objection to this claim moot.

Drawings

The Action objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) and asserts that the subject matter of claim 6 is not shown in the drawings. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the objection. Claim 6 recites that the shape of the aperture part is formed so as to have different opening widths in the rolling direction of the rolling element body. The Action asserts that aperture 126 appears rectangular in Figure 14. However, aperture 126 is such a small element in Figure

14 that its shape is difficult to correctly express. This is why Figure 17 is provided, which is an enlargement of aperture 126 and clearly shows that aperture 126 is formed so as to have different opening widths. Since the subject matter of claim 6 is shown in Figure 17, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 were presented. Claims 10, 12 and 20, which are withdrawn from consideration, are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 3, 13, 18 and 19 are also canceled, without prejudice. Claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, 11 and 14-17 are amended. Accordingly, after entry of this amendment, claims 2, 4-9, 11, 14-17, 21 and 22 are pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

The indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8, 9, 11, 14 and 15 is noted and appreciated. Claims 8, 11, 14 and 15 are rewritten in independent form, including all limitations of base and intervening claims. Claim 9 depends from claim 8. Accordingly, claims 8, 9, 11, 14 and 15 are now in allowable form.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 1-4, 13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Pandya. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Rohmann. Although not expressly stated in the Action, applicant assumes that claim 19 is also rejected as anticipated by these references, in view of its similarity to dependent claim 2.

Claims 1, 3, 13, 18 and 19 are canceled, without prejudice, rendering their rejections moot. Claims 2, 4 and 5 are allowable by virtue of their amendment to depend from allowable claim 8. Claims 6 and 7 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 5, which now depends from claim 8. Claims 16 and 17 are allowable by virtue of their amendment to depend from allowable claim 8.

For these reasons, applicant submits that the rejections of claims 2, 4, 5-7, 16 and 17 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Appl. No. 10/671,338
Amdt. Dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 22, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81868.0104
Customer No. 26021

New claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 21 and 22 are identical to allowable claims 16 and 17, but depend from claim 14 rather than from claim 8.

Conclusion

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration of this response. Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: May 23, 2005

By:


Troy M. Schmelzer
Registration No. 36,667
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701